

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated April 13, 2006.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki et al., U.S. Publication No. 2001/0050802 A1, in view of Pedersen et al., U.S. Publication No. 2001/0167719 A1, Lauder et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0109896 A1, and Hempstead, U.S. Publication No. 2001/0118447 A1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a]n optical amplification method for an optical transmission system including a plurality of first light sources for Raman amplification that amplify signal light transmitted in said optical transmission line and a plurality of second light sources for Raman amplification that are disposed at positions adjoining respective ones of said plurality of first light sources for Raman amplification via said optical transmission line, comprising the steps of: ... providing one or more spare pumping light sources for said plurality of second light sources for Raman amplification, the number of said spare pumping light sources being less than the number of said second light sources, a number of said second light sources not having spare pumping light sources, intervening between two of said second light sources having spare pumping light sources, being determined by a permissible failure rate of the optical transmission system; ...”

Independent claim 16 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a]n optical amplification method for an optical transmission system including a plurality of first light sources for Raman amplification for amplifying signal light at a first wavelength transmitted in said optical transmission line and a second plurality of second light sources for Raman amplification for amplifying signal light at a second wavelength transmitted in said optical transmission line, wherein ones of said plurality of second light sources for Raman amplification are disposed at positions adjoining respective ones of said first light sources for Raman amplification, said method comprising the steps of: ... providing a first single spare pumping light source operating at said first wavelength for a certain number of said first light sources for Raman amplification, and a second single spare

pumping light source operating at said second wavelength for a certain number of said second light sources for Raman amplification; ... said certain number of said first light sources for Raman amplification and said certain number of said second light sources for Raman amplification being determined by a permissible failure rate of the optical transmission system.” Antecedent basis for the amendments to independent claims 11 and 16 is found in the specification, for example, on page 16, lines 19-26, and in the drawings, for example, in Fig. 4.

In contrast, the cited portions of Namiki et al., Pedersen et al., Lauder et al., and Hempstead do not disclose, teach, or suggest the determination of: (1) the number of light sources for Raman amplification for each spare pumping light source or (2) the number of light sources for Raman amplification not having spare pumping light sources, intervening between two light sources for Raman amplification having spare pumping light sources, by a permissible failure rate of the optical transmission system, as required by independent claims 11 and 16, (Office Action, page 4, paragraph 7, to page 5, line 12).


Since each of claims 12-15 is directly dependent upon independent claim 11, each of claims 12-15 is allowable over Namiki et al., Pedersen et al., Lauder et al., and Hempstead for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 11 over Namiki et al., Pedersen et al., Lauder et al., and Hempstead.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 11-16 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON AUGUST 4, 2006


MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No. 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700